



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/157,018	09/18/1998	BENJAMIN KILGORE	MS-80	1865

27662 7590 06/19/2002

LYON, HARR & DEFRANK
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 800
OXNARD, CA 93030

EXAMINER

LUU, SY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/157,018

Applicant(s)

KILGORE, BENJAMIN

Examiner

Sy D Luu

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 and Amendment D, both filed 2/20/2002. The cited prior art, Maggioncalda et al. (US 6,012,044), was removed according to the request as presented in the Declaration.

2. Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 13 and 18 are independent claims. In the Amendment D, claims 1, 2 and 13 were amended, and claim 18 was added. This action is made Non-Final.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 2174

5. Claims 1-4 and 6-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maritzen et al. ("Maritzen", US # 5,870,719).

As per independent claims 1, 10 and 14, Maritzen teaches a method for dynamically displaying data values on a client computer (fig. 2; *client 220*), comprising:

receiving transmitted results, sub-items associated with the results, and rules of enforcement of sub-item combinations in a predefined format through a communications interface in response to a request from the client; and processing the results in real time using the client computer in response to user adjustment of the results and the sub-item configuration on the client computer; and displaying a first set of results, and dynamically displaying the processed results on a client display device (fig. 5; col. 7, lines 39-50).

Maritzen does not explicitly disclose the method to comprise: preventing sub-item conflicts using the transmitted rules of enforcement, the rules of enforcement for sub-item combination to be processed in the background, and the rules for selection and combination of the associated options automatically prevent user selection or combination of incompatible or conflicting options. However, these step would have been inherent to a method such as Maritzen so as to allow the system to process transmitted results transparently to users and display sub-items in combination logically and properly, especially when they are mutually exclusive of each other.

Independent claims 2, 13 and 18 are similar in scope to claim 1, in that all claims involve: a client requesting for data values to be transmitted from a server (fig. 2; *server 240*) performing a database query; and specific dynamic output results derived from the data values as a result of user adjustments in real time via an user interface in the client. Claim 13 further indicates that

Art Unit: 2174

the data values are pricing data (*price lists and quote*). Claims 2, 13 and 18 are therefore rejected under similar rationale as claim 1.

As per claims 3-4, Maritzen further discloses the adjustable interface tools to comprise input boxes for adjusting criteria of associated criteria in real time as well as the interface tools being controls in a dialog box (fig. 5).

As per claim 6, Maritzen discloses the GUI to have at least one graphical control for allowing the user to dynamically adjust the results and associated sub-items (fig. 5; *e.g. radio buttons and check boxes*).

As per claim 7, Maritzen teaches the data values to comprise pricing data for at least one object, and the associated sub-items comprise user selectable options for the objects (fig. 5; *price list and quote etc.*).

As per claims 8-9 and 15, Maritzen teaches the interface tools to include: at least one previously selected sub-items are automatically deselected when a user selects a new sub-item which conflicts with the at least one previously selected sub-items; at least one additional sub-items to be automatically selected when a user selects a sub-item which requires selection of the at least one additional sub-items; and the pricing data and associated options are dynamically updated and displayed on the client display device in response to user interaction with the pricing data and associated options (fig. 5; col. 7, line 48 – col. 8, line 24).

As per claim 11, Maritzen teaches remote processing of the results and associated sub-items to continue in response to user interaction with the results and associated sub-items on the client display device after the communications interface between the server and the client has been terminated (col. 7, lines 52-60)

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 12, Maritzen teaches the GUI to have at least one graphical control for allowing the user to dynamically adjust the displayed data and sub-items (fig. 5; *e.g. radio buttons and check boxes*).

Claims 16-17 are similar in scope to claims 8-9 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maritzen et al. ("Maritzen", US # 5,870,719).

As per claim 5, Maritzen does not explicitly disclose the interface tools to include dynamically coupled check boxes so that designated check boxes dynamically change as a user configures conflicting interface tools constrained by the logical rules of enforcement. Official Notice is given that this feature is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include this feature in Maritzen's interface tools in order to aid and visually facilitate user interaction with a constrained set of decision variables.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments in the Amendment D have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2174

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Schneider et al. (US 5,832,452) teaches a database inquiry system, wherein searches were made on the database and a resultant list satisfying a set of criteria is displayed.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sy Luu whose telephone number is (703) 305-0409. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 7:00 am to 4:30 pm (EST). The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Sy D. Luu
Patent Examiner
June 13, 2002